

Recent Actions and Research for Consideration Under SBE Accountability Framework

System Performance Accountability Meeting (SPA) June 16, 2009

Executive Summary

The Federal Government is providing almost \$1 billion over the next two years to Washington (and additional funds to other states) to initiate school reform and improvement efforts while also saving and creating jobs and stimulating the economy. With the passage of ESHB 2261, the Legislature affirmed its intent to have the SBE create a proactive and collaborative system of accountability.

One of the major concerns in developing an effective accountability system is the identification of achievement gaps between students within schools, districts, states, and other countries. Teachers and other education professionals can make a significant difference in closing that achievement gap. The role of the family and community is also important.

The literature on the defining qualities of a high performing school resonates with common themes. Successful schools demonstrate a "continuity of focus on core instruction; heavy investments in highly targeted professional development for teachers and principals in the fundamentals of strong classroom instruction; strong and explicit accountability by principals and teachers for the quality of practice and the level of student performance; and a normative climate in which adults take responsibility for their own, their colleagues', and their students' learning." ¹

Strategies oriented toward improving schools through whole school reform or school choice may be less effective than focusing on improving the teaching profession.² The broad, research-based consensus of the importance of teacher effectiveness in providing a catalyst for school reform must remain at the forefront of the state/school board's plan for voluntary/required action under the SBE Accountability Framework.

Based on the research included in this report, a bulleted list of actionable items in the following four areas should be considered as the Board continues its accountability work:

1. Deeper Analysis of Struggling Schools and SBE Key Indicators for Report Card

- Examine indicators of teacher distribution and quality, family and community support, and the achievement gap between different groups of students.

¹<http://www.uknow.gse.harvard.edu/leadership/leadership001b.html>

² <http://www.miamiherald.com/460/story/1049341.html> Miami-Dade County Public Schools: School Improvement Zone, Final Evaluation Report May 2009. Office of Program Evaluation for Miami Public Schools Steve Urdegar. pviii

2. School Improvement Rule

- Add analysis of achievement gap.
- Determine which parts of the Nine Characteristics of High Performing Schools to include, specifically.
- Determine whether we want to have a district improvement plan.

3. Voluntary Programs

- Provide incentives for districts to align curriculum with standards in recommended menus from OSPI.
- Provide incentives for districts to improve, through Innovation Zone particularly, in the following areas:
 - Quality teaching.
 - Personalized learning environments for students.
 - Expanded early learning opportunities.
 - Family and community support for students.
 - Adoption of CORE 24 and innovative high schools.

4. Required Action for State/Local Collaboration

- More than one reform solution may be needed to correct the course of a struggle school.

Recent Actions and Research for Consideration Under SBE Accountability Framework

System Performance Accountability Meeting (SPA) June 16, 2009

This paper covers three areas:

1. Recent federal and state actions.
2. A review of recent research and implications for State Board of Education (SBE) accountability work.
3. Considerations for accountability framework.

I. Recent Action

1. Federal Government

The U.S. Department of Education is providing almost \$1 billion over the next two years to Washington through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) under state fiscal stabilization funding “to initiate school reform and improvement efforts while also saving and creating jobs and stimulating the economy.”³ These are one-time resources. The goals are to ensure all students to graduate from high school prepared for college and a career and with the opportunity to complete at least one year of postsecondary education. ARRA identifies four core reforms that will help the nation meet that goal:

- Adopting rigorous college- and career-ready standards and high-quality assessments.
- Establishing data systems and using data for improvement.
- Increasing teacher effectiveness and equitable distribution of effective teachers.
- Turning around the lowest-performing schools.⁴

In addition, funding will be available through competitive grants, such as the Race to the Top Grant and Local Innovation Grants.

2. Washington State

The Governor submitted an application on May 15 to the U.S. Department of Education for the state stabilization funding, providing evidence that Washington is making progress on the four assurances listed above.

The Governor signed ESHB 2261 on May 19 and affirmed the Legislature’s direction to the State Board of Education’s (SBE) accountability framework, as described in the Board’s January 2009 Accountability Resolution. ESHB 2261 also redefined basic

³ <http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/index.html#apps>
Using ARRA Funds to Drive School Reform and Improvement (Apr 24, 2009)

⁴ <http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/index.html#apps>
Using ARRA Funds to Drive School Reform and Improvement (Apr 24, 2009)

education to include critical components (e.g., all day kindergarten, 24 high school graduation requirements) needed to enhance Washington students' learning for the 21st century. There is work ahead to create stable funding sources that support these new requirements as well as to determine the phasing in of these requirements.

Legislative intent is to create a proactive, collaborative system of accountability based on progressive levels of support and with a goal of continuous improvement in student achievement. The law directs the SBE and SPI to seek approval for use of the system for federal accountability purposes.

ESHB 2261 requires the SBE to continue refining an accountability framework that includes:

- An accountability index to identify successful schools and those in need of assistance.
- A proposal and timeline for a comprehensive system of voluntary support and assistance to be submitted to the Legislature before implementation.
- A proposal and timeline for a system targeted to those that have not demonstrated improvement that takes effect only if authorized by the Legislature. This corrective action includes an academic performance audit and a binding school board-developed corrective action plan (subject to SBE approval), and progress monitoring by SPI.
- A proposal is due to the Legislature on December 1, 2009.
- The Legislature must formally approve the proposal before any actions take place.

II. A Review of Recent Research and Evaluation Studies on Improving Student Achievement and Implications for Washington Accountability Framework

I. Addressing the Achievement Gap

a. International and National Studies

McKinsey and Company recently produced a study "The Economic Impact of the Achievement Gap in America's Schools"⁵, which reinforces what we have known for some time – that there are achievement gaps for American students both in comparison with other industrialized countries, among states, between racial groups and income groups of students, among districts, among schools within districts, and among classrooms within schools. Of particular note, there is more variation in student achievement within schools than between schools. Below are some examples of their findings:

- The gap between the U.S. and other countries' performance increases the longer children are in school – our students score in the top half of students in fourth grade and in the bottom half of students by the age of 15.
- The U.S. ranks 18 out of 24 industrialized nations for high school graduation rates.
- A low income student in the U.S. is less likely to do well than a low income student in other industrialized countries.

⁵<http://www.mckinsey.com/client/service/socialsector/achievementgap.asp> McKinsey and Company "The Economic Impact of the Achievement Gap in America's Schools" April 2009

- Fewer African American and Latino students score at the advanced level of NAEP, and their performance decreases as students move from grade 4 to 12.
- Texas and California have similar demographics, and yet Texas students, on average, are one to two years ahead of California students at the same grade level.
- Washington D.C. poor African American students are four years behind poor Caucasian students in Massachusetts.
- The variation in American student performance within schools in New York City was 2.6 times the variation between schools in 2006 PISA math results.

Some themes from their findings include:

- Lagging achievement is not only a problem for poor and minority students but also middle class students as well.
- There are inequities in teacher quality and school funding.
- Schools and school systems can have a significant impact on student achievement.
- States lack data systems that provide useful and timely data on student progress.

The Nation's Report Card 2008 reviewed trends in academic progress in reading and math on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and found that since 1971, African American students have made greater gains in reading and math than Caucasian students in all age categories. Hispanic students have made greater gains in reading and math than Caucasian students at ages nine and 17, but not 13 for reading (although there were gains in math). The greatest narrowing in gaps occurred between 1971 and 2004 in reading, with no significant changes from 2004-2008. Caucasians continue to score approximately 20-30 points higher than African Americans and Hispanics in 2008, for reading and math.⁶

b. Washington Study

Ed Trust has published its state by state Education Watch report,⁷ which covers how students are doing on NAEP and state assessments, where achievement gaps exist and how big they are, high school and college graduation rates, teacher quality, academic rigor, and education funding. Students Washington State score above the national average on NAEP despite the low ranking our state has for per pupil spending. We have similar achievement gaps for race and ethnicity, as well as by income compared to those highlighted nationally. Our state is one of the lowest ranked for teaching qualifications; a large percentage of core academic subjects in grades 7-12 are taught by teachers with neither a major nor certification in the applied discipline. Our state is one of the top states ranked for helping low income families pay for college.

⁶ <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pubs/main2008/2009479.asp#pdflist> The Nation's Report Card: 2008 Trends in Academic Progress April 2009

⁷ <http://www2.edtrust.org/EdTrust/Data+Tools+and+Presentations> Education Watch Washington State Report April 2009

2. Quality Teaching

a. International Studies

McKinsey and Company conducted a study on twenty-five of the world's school systems, including the top ten performers. They found that: "three things matter most:

- Getting the right people to become teachers.
- Developing them into effective instructors.
- Ensuring that the system is able to deliver the best possible instruction for every child."⁸

b. National Studies

In addition to the top performing schools and systems internationally, there has been considerable research on high performing schools in the U.S. High performing schools demonstrate: "Continuity of focus on core instruction; heavy investments in highly targeted professional development for teachers and principals in the fundamentals of strong classroom instruction; strong and explicit accountability by principals and teachers for the quality of practice and the level of student performance; and a normative climate in which adults take responsibility for their own, their colleagues', and their students' learning."⁹

In the U.S. Department of Education 2009 Final Report on State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, states reported that teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools were more likely to report that they were not highly qualified. Moreover, even among teachers who were considered highly qualified, teachers in high-poverty schools had less experience and were less likely to have a degree in the subject they taught.¹⁰

An evaluation was conducted to examine teacher effectiveness based on the different routes to certification (both alternative and traditional certification). The study found there was no statistically significant difference in student performance between those who had teachers who went through alternative certification versus those who went through traditional certification. In addition, there was no evidence that the content of the course work was correlated with teacher effectiveness.¹¹

Since 1994, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) has offered advanced level certification for teachers. Although participation numbers have increased significantly with NBPTS certification at three percent of the teaching force in the U.S., the number of teachers from diverse race or ethnic backgrounds is small. Washington State has one of the highest numbers of

⁸ <http://www.mckinsey.com/client/service/socialsector/index.asp>, "How the World's Best-Performing School Systems Come Out on Top" September 2007.

⁹ <http://www.uknow.gse.harvard.edu/leadership/leadership001b.html>

¹⁰ <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oepdp/ppss/reports.html#tq> Final Report on State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, Volume VIII- Teacher Quality 2009

¹¹ <http://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=NCEE20094043> An Evaluation of Teachers Trained Through Different Routes to Certification February 2009.

Board certified teachers. Several studies show a small relationship between board certification and student achievement. Many school systems do not use Board certified teachers to mentor fellow teachers or to work in more challenging schools. Additional research is needed to examine relationship between Board certified teachers and student learning, teacher practice, teacher career paths, impact on the educational system, and cost effectiveness of Board certification.¹² Note: Washington provides a \$5,000 bonus for teachers with National Board Certification to teach in schools with a high free and reduced lunch population. Currently 17% of National Board Certified teachers in Washington teach in these schools.

The National Council on Teacher Quality 2008 Yearbook¹³ reviewed current state practices for retaining high quality teachers. Some of their key findings were:

1. States grant teachers tenure without considering whether they are effective.
2. States are not doing enough to help districts identify effective teachers.
3. States are complicit in keeping ineffective teachers in the classroom.
4. State policies raise barriers and offer few incentives to retain effective teachers.

While there is no empirical data that shows that U.S. performance incentives are linked to substantial gains in improving student achievement or accelerating growth in the teaching profession, the following research¹⁴ on teacher incentive pay has been well documented:

1. An effective teacher significantly improves a student's achievement, regardless of students' innate abilities and home and neighborhood socioeconomic circumstances.
2. Sustained, multiyear contact with an effective teacher can materially mitigate students' accumulated achievement deficits.
3. The current distribution of identified effective teachers favors students from higher socioeconomic circumstances.
4. While current considerations in the determination of public school teacher pay—seniority and added academic credits—have ameliorated past injustices and provided predictability and objectivity, they display only minimal relationships with elevated student academic achievement.

The following research has not yet been documented:

1. The power of financial awards in promoting more-effective teaching and elevating student performance.
2. The effects of group awards relative to individual performance awards.
3. The preferable mix of financial and non-pecuniary awards.
4. The long-term effect of performance awards on the supply of effective teachers.

¹² <http://www.nap.edu> National Academy of Sciences, "Assessing Accomplished Teaching: Advanced-Level Certification Programs 2008.

¹³ <http://www.nctq.org/p/> State Teacher Policy Yearbook 2008

¹⁴ <http://www.edweek.org> The Question of Performance Pay by James Guthrie and Patrick Schuermann October 29, 2008

5. The consequences of offering higher pay for teachers in subject shortage areas and hard-to-staff schools.
6. The cost-effectiveness of performance incentives relative to alternative strategies for elevating academic achievement, such as class-size reduction, enhanced reliance on educational specialists, or intensified deployment of technology.

3. NCLB Requirements for Choice, Tutoring, and Restructuring

a. National and State Perspectives

The number of students participating in Title I public school choice and supplemental educational services (SES) increased substantially by the 2006–2007 school year. However, participation rates remained consistently low, with most eligible students not participating — only one percent for the Title I public school choice option and 17 percent for SES. According to parents, the primary reasons for nonparticipation in public school choice were satisfaction with the child's current school or inconvenient locations of alternate schools. Parents chose not to enroll children in SES because they believed that their children did not need help or because the services were provided at inconvenient times. In addition, public school choice was constrained at the middle and high school levels because more than half of the districts required to offer choice had no alternate middle or high schools to which eligible students could transfer.¹⁵

The Center on Education Policy completed studies¹⁶ of five different states' approaches to improving low performing schools that did not meet test score targets for six or more years, with a focus on the NCLB provisions for restructuring. These include:

1. Replacing all or most of the staff.
2. Contracting with an outside organization to operate the school.
3. Becoming a charter school.
4. Allowing the state to take over a school.
5. Undertaking another form of major restructuring.

They found that “no single reform guarantees success.” Very few schools selected any of the restructuring options one through four. Under the fifth option, many of the schools used outside technical assistance with a focus on coaching, analysis of student data, and professional development for teachers. “Many restructured schools continue to need extra resources and attention to sustain their progress.”¹⁷

¹⁵ http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB9414/index1.html No Child Left Behind Educational Options (2009)

¹⁶ <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2009/05/13/31jennings.h28.html?qs=Jack+Jennings> Rethinking 'Restructuring' Lessons Learned From Five States Over Five Years (Note: The 5 state case studies can be found at: <http://www.cep-dc.org/>)

¹⁷ <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2009/05/13/31jennings.h28.html?qs=Jack+Jennings> Rethinking 'Restructuring' Lessons Learned From Five States Over Five Years (Note: The 5 state case studies can be found at: <http://www.cep-dc.org/>)

Mass Insight has done extensive research on high performing high poverty schools in the U.S. and distilled the information into nine strategies that provide:

1. Safety, discipline, and engagement.
2. Direct action to focus on students' poverty driven deficits.
3. Close student adult relationships.
4. Shared responsibility for achievement.
5. Personalization of instruction using diagnostic assessments and adjustable time on task.
6. Continuous improvement through collaboration and job-embedded learning.
7. School leaders who can have authority to make decisions about people, time and money.
8. Leaders who can leverage resources and partners to enhance their work.
9. System flexibility to respond to changing conditions.¹⁸

The Rand Corporation has completed a study on the student outcomes from charter schools in eight states. This study is the first to use longitudinal, student-level data to systematically examine these issues across multiple communities and varied charter laws. The four key findings are:

1. Charter schools are not skimming the highest-achieving students from traditional public schools, nor are they creating racial stratification.
2. On average, across varying communities and policy environments, charter middle and high schools produce achievement gains that are about the same as those in traditional public school (with the exception of online virtual schools).
3. Charter schools do not appear to help or harm student achievement in nearby traditional public schools.
4. Students who attended charter high schools were more likely to graduate and go on to college.¹⁹

b. Specific District Studies

Miami-Dade County Public Schools completed a three year School Improvement Zone.²⁰ The former Superintendent, Rudi Crew, initiated this School Improvement Zone to improve student achievement in 39 low performing Miami-Dade County Public Schools under a three year timeframe. The purpose of the program was to utilize a top down approach to "advance high achievement while eliminating low performance". The schools selected were required to participate. The elements of the program were:

- A core literacy program that extended from prekindergarten through grade 12.
- A structured curriculum with instructional strategies across grades and school levels.
- Additional instructional time through an extended day and school year.
- Enhanced professional development for teachers.

¹⁸ <http://www.massinsight.org/whatwedo/turnaround/index.aspx>

¹⁹ <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG869/> Are Charter Schools Making a Difference? March 2009

²⁰ <http://www.miamiherald.com/460/story/1049341.html> Miami-Dade County Public Schools: School Improvement Zone, Final Evaluation Report May 2009. Office of Program Evaluation for Miami Public Schools Steve Urdegarr.

Research then compared these 39 schools and a control group of schools that did not participate in the program but had the same student demographics (although there was no random selection between the two groups). Students test scores from both groups were reviewed on reading, writing, science and mathematics. The bottom line was that the School Improvement Zone did not show a consistent positive impact. Other findings include that the costly additions, such as extended day and school year, resulted in excessive absences in the summer and that proficient students felt stigmatized by additional time in school. Morale and administrative turnover were also issues. Conclusions were that strategies oriented toward improving schools through whole school reform or school choice may be less effective than focusing on improving the teaching profession.²¹

Researchers also evaluated forty charter schools in New York City where students are selected through a lottery. They found that the policy most notable and robust was a longer school year of 220 days.²²

4. Parent Involvement

A meta-analysis was done using 52 studies to determine the influence of parental involvement on the educational outcomes of urban secondary school children. A variety of educational outcomes were analyzed: including student grades, student performance on standardized tests, and other measures that generally included teacher rating scales and indices of academic attitudes and behaviors. The results indicate that the influence of parental involvement for all income levels and racial ethnicity is significant for secondary school children. The aspects of parent involvement that is most effective were reading and communicating with children as well as parental expectations²³

5. Other Factors Related to Student Outcomes

a. Washington Joint Basic Education Finance Task Force

As a part of the Joint Basic Education Finance Task Force work in 2008, the Washington State Institute for Public Policy examined the evidence-based options that improve student outcomes as measured by test score improvements (or increased high school graduation rates). While the conclusions²⁴ of the Institute on research literature may not be an exhaustive list of research conducted 2007-2008, here are some of their findings:

²¹ <http://www.miamiherald.com/460/story/1049341.html> Miami-Dade County Public Schools: School Improvement Zone, Final Evaluation Report May 2009. Office of Program Evaluation for Miami Public Schools Steve Urdegar. pviii

²² <http://www.eric.ed.gov/> Charter Schools in New York City: Who Enrolls and How They Affect Their Students' Achievement. NBER Working Paper No. 14852 April 2009 Carolyn Hoxby and Sonali Murarka

²³ <http://uex.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/42/1/82> **The Relationship Between Parental Involvement and Urban Secondary School Student Academic Achievement William Jaynes 2007**
<http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/browse-our-publications/parental-involvement-and-student-achievement-a-meta-analysis>

²⁴ <http://www.leg.wa.gov/Joint/Committees/BEF/> Final Report of the Joint Task Force on Basic Education Finance Report to the Washington State Legislature. Staff research work by the Washington State Institute of Public Policy January 14, 2009 pp B-3 and B-4

- **Class size reductions.** We found that reductions in the early grades have a statistically significant effect on short run test scores, while the effect in higher grades is either statistically insignificant or very slightly positive.
- **Per pupil expenditure changes.** We found statistically significant, though fairly small, effects for general increases in K–12 spending as applied in typical K–12 structures. The effects are a bit larger in the early grades than in later grades.
- **Teacher pay for graduate degrees and teacher experience.** We found no statistically significant effect for graduate degrees and a nonlinear effect for teacher experience with the largest gains in the first few years of teaching.
- **Professional development for teachers.** There are very few credible studies of the effect of teacher professional development on student outcomes; the few studies we found suggested small or statistically insignificant results, but, again, there are too few studies from which to form reliable estimates.
- **Early childhood education.** We found a substantial effect on the later test scores for low income three and four year olds who attended the average preschool.
- **Full day vs. half day kindergarten.** We found a significant short run improvement in test scores for full day kindergarten, but the effect appears to decay in grades 1–3. More research is needed on how to maintain the initial substantial gains.
- **New performance based systems for teacher compensation.** We found too few credible studies, to date, that have evaluated the pay experiments that are underway in some parts of the United States.
- **Mentoring programs.** In an unpublished and incomplete review, we have found only a few credible studies on this topic, and the results are mixed.”

b. **Nine Characteristics of High Performing Schools**

The Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction updated its research report in 2007 on Nine Characteristics of High Performing Schools²⁵ and listed the following as researched based ways to improve student learning. OSPI has designed a rubric districts²⁶ can use to assess their status in each of the following areas:

1. **Clear and Shared Focus.** Everybody knows where they are going and why. The focus is on achieving a shared vision, and all understand their

²⁵ <http://www.k12.wa.us/Research/default> Nine Characteristics of High Performing Schools Sue Shannon and Pete Bylsma 2007 update

²⁶ <http://www.k12.wa.us/Research/default>. Characteristics of Improved School Districts *Performing Schools* (Shannon & Bylsma, 2003) reflects most of the themes identified in the nine characteristics of high performing schools analysis, there are substantial differences in the roles and responsibilities of school districts and those of individual schools. The report examines four categories: Effective Leadership, Quality Teaching and Learning, Support for Systematic Improvement, Clear and Collaborative Relations

role in achieving the vision. The focus and vision are developed from common beliefs and values, creating a consistent direction for all involved.

2. **High Standards and Expectations for All Students.** Teachers and staff believe that all students can learn and meet high standards. While recognizing that some students must overcome significant barriers, these obstacles are not seen as insurmountable. Students are offered an ambitious and rigorous course of study.
3. **Effective School Leadership.** Effective instructional and administrative leadership is required to implement change processes. Effective leaders proactively seek needed help. They nurture an instructional program and school culture conducive to learning and professional growth. Effective leaders have different styles and roles – teachers and other staff, including those in the district office, often have a leadership role.
4. **High Levels of Collaboration and Communication.** There is strong teamwork among teachers across all grades and with other staff. Everybody is involved and connected to each other, including parents and members of the community, to identify problems and work on solutions.
5. **Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Aligned with Standards.** The planned and actual curriculum is aligned with the essential academic learning requirements (EALRs). Research-based teaching strategies and materials are used. Staff understands the role of classroom and state assessments, what the assessments measure, and how student work is evaluated.
6. **Frequent Monitoring of Learning and Teaching.** A steady cycle of different assessments identify students who need help. More support and instructional time is provided, either during the school day or outside normal school hours. Teaching is adjusted, based on frequent monitoring of student progress and needs. Assessment results are used to focus and improve instructional programs.
7. **Focused Professional Development.** A strong emphasis is placed on training staff in areas of most need. Feedback from learning and teaching focuses extensive and ongoing professional development. The support is also aligned with the school or district vision and objectives.
8. **Supportive Learning Environment.** The school has a safe, civil, healthy, and intellectually stimulating learning environment. Students feel respected and connected with the staff and are engaged in learning. Instruction is personalized and small learning environments increase student contact with teachers.
9. **High Levels of Family and Community Involvement.** There is a sense that all have a responsibility to educate students, not just teachers and school staff. Families, businesses, social service agencies, and community colleges/universities all play a vital role in this effort.

6. Implications for the Washington Framework

Recent studies and those reviewed in the last several years focus on the need to improve classroom instruction and personnel practices rather than whole school reform.

Dr. Richard Elmore, from Harvard's Graduate School of Education, recommends the following roles for policy makers, researchers and practitioners: "Policy makers should focus on "translating" diverse political interests and adjudicating conflicts between them to arrive at goals regarding what should be taught, the rewards offered for getting the job done, and the sanctions aimed at those schools or individuals consistently failing to improve... Distinguished practitioners, professional developers, and researchers (should) design pre-service and in-service learning opportunities and pilot successful new instructional practices. Administrative leader (should) design improvements in "resource allocation, hiring, evaluation, retention, and accountability."²⁷

The Rennie Center for Education describes key roles for state departments of education to undertake:

1. Providing guidance on curricular materials aligned to state standards as well as diagnostic tools and data to help teachers understand the skills and knowledge of their individual students.
2. Moving schools beyond the school improvement planning stage to address identified deficiencies in curriculum, professional development, and assessment.
3. Setting standards for educators and increasing training programs for leaders.
4. Increasing expert staff in curriculum and professional development areas, particularly for math, special education and English Language Learners.²⁸

Randi Weingarten, President of the United Federation of Teachers in New York, proposes an accountability system that "presents a more balanced picture of the strengths and weaknesses of each school, where it is succeeding and where it needs help. It focuses on what makes a school not only academically successful, but also safe, collegial, and well supported—one that educates not only every child, but the whole child. [She suggests] four distinct pillars: academic achievement; safety, order, and discipline; teamwork for student achievement; and central-administration accountability. The information for making judgments would come primarily from three sources—available hard data, reports of highly trained independent teams who observe and evaluate schools on-site, and the results of a comprehensive survey of parents, teachers, administrators, and students."²⁹

²⁷ <http://www.uknow.gse.harvard.edu/leadership/leadership001b.html>

²⁸ Rennie Center for Education, "Reaching Capacity: A Blueprint for the State Role in Improving Low Performing Schools and Districts" Spring 2005

²⁹ <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2008/05/14/37weingarten.h27.html?print=1>

II. Considerations for SBE Accountability Framework

Based on the research above, a bulleted list of actionable items in the following four areas should be considered as the Board continues its work.

1. Deeper Analysis of Struggling Schools and SBE Key Indicators for Report Card

- Examine indicators of teacher distribution and quality, family and community support, and the achievement gap between different groups of students.

2. School Improvement Rule

- Add analysis of achievement gap.
- Determine which parts of the Nine Characteristics of High Performing Schools to include specifically.
- Determine whether we want to have anything about a district improvement plan.

3. Voluntary Programs

- Provide incentives for districts to align curriculum with standards in recommended menus from OSPI
- Provide incentives for districts to innovate through Innovation Zone particularly in the following areas:
 - ✓ Ensure quality teaching.
 - ✓ Personalize learning environments for students.
 - ✓ Expand early learning.
 - ✓ Foster family and community support for students.
 - ✓ Adoption of CORE 24 and innovative high schools.

4. Required Action for State/Local Collaboration

- a. More than one reform solution will be needed to turn the schools in a district around.